



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/872,378

06/01/2001

Robert R. Turvey

J-2904

2808

7590 08/27/2008  
Kristin L. Chapman  
S.C. Johnson & Son Home Storage  
1525 Howe Street  
Racine, WI 53403-2236

EXAMINER

PARADISO, JOHN ROGER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3721

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/27/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* ROBERT R. TURVEY

---

Appeal 2008-0191  
Application 09/872,378  
Technology Center 3700

---

Decided: August 27, 2008

---

Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, DAVID B. WALKER, and BIBHU R.  
MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WALKER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. §§ 6(b) and 134(a) (2002) from the final rejection of claims 1-36. We reverse.

Representative claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method of producing plastic bags, the method comprising the steps of:  
folding a web of plastic to form an elongate

folded web having free ends;  
securing closer tape to the free ends of the  
elongate folded web;  
forming end stops in the closer tape at  
spaced locations thereof, such step including the  
step of creating an indicia in each of the end stops,  
wherein the indicia designates at least one of a  
production line that produced the plastic bags and  
a time at which the bags were produced; and  
simultaneously severing and sealing the  
elongate folded web at each of the spaced locations  
to produce individual bags.

The reference set forth below is relied upon as evidence in support of  
the rejection:

Thieman	US 5,956,924	Sep. 28, 1999
---------	--------------	---------------

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable  
over Thieman.

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner bears the  
initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re*  
*Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). *See also In re Piasecki*, 745  
F.2d 1468, 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Only if this initial burden is met does the  
burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shift to the appellant.  
*Id.* at 1445. *See also Piasecki*, 745 F.2d at 1472. Obviousness is then  
determined on the basis of the evidence as a whole and the relative  
persuasiveness of the arguments. *See Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1445; *Piasecki*,  
745 F.2d at 1472.

Each of the rejected claims require “creating an indicia . . . wherein  
the indicia designates at least one of a production line that produced the

plastic bags and a time at which the bags were produced” (*See, e.g.*, independent claims 1 and 19).

The Appellant argues that Thieman does not teach or suggest such indicia, and that such indicia have a new and nonobvious functional relationship with the plastic bag (Br. 4 & 6-7). The Appellant argues that indicia is defined as “a distinctive mark that indicates or that is felt to indicate the nature or quality of or existence or reality of something” (Br. 4; citing *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*). According to Appellant, Thieman discloses a pattern on the end stops that is no more distinctive than any other feature of the bag (Br. 4).

The Examiner found that indicia is broadly defined as “distinctive marks” (Answer 4; citing *Merriam Webster Dictionary*). The Examiner argues that crosshatching on the bag of Thieman is distinctive indicia that permits the machine operator to tell by looking if the weld was performed properly or not (Answer 4).

We agree with Appellant that Thieman does not teach indicia when that term is given its broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification. The Examiner relies on the cross-hatch pattern shown on end stops 36 and 38 on the plastic bag in Figure 1 of Thieman as indicia. Thieman does not disclose any purpose for the cross-hatching, which is not described in its specification, or explicitly describe the function of the end stops 36 and 38. The end stops appear to serve the functions of stopping the travel of the slider 48 and providing a gripping surface for holding the bag when moving slider 48. We find no teaching in Thieman of using the cross hatching as distinctive marks or of any other distinctive marks that would meet the claim limitation of indicia under either the Appellant’s or

Appeal 2008-0191  
Application 09/872,378

Examiner's definition of the term. Because each of the appealed claims requires indicia, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness of claims 1-36 over Thieman.

The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

hh

Kristin L. Chapman  
S.C. Johnson & Son Home Storage  
1525 Howe Street  
Racine, WI 53403-2236